

Design Standards Committee Meeting Minutes
November 20, 2002
City of Tukwila
Suite 100 Conference Room 5
Tukwila, WA 98188
9:00AM – 3:30PM

At a Glance

- Introductions
- Interpretation of City and County Design Standards
- Draft Guidelines for Accessible Public Rights of Way
- Design Deviations vs. Design Exceptions on Trails
- Traffic Calming Guidance, what is available
- LAG Roundabout standard
- Adoption of AASHTO Very Low Volume Roads
- Clear Zone Policy
- Stopping Sight Distance
- Design Matrix

IN DETAIL

Present:

Al King, Gary Hughes, Lynn Price, Ken Brown, Jim Whitbread, Dale Rancour, Jim Seitz, Randy Hart, Larry Schofield, Dick Albin, Mike Johnson, Jim Nichols, Pat O'Neill, Jolene Gosselin, Paul Bennett, Bob Turpin, Randy Hart, Paula Reeves, and Ron Pate

Introductions

All present introduced themselves.

Interpretation of City and County Design Standards

Al King discussed the draft document "Intent clarification for, Geometric Cross Section chart for Two-Way Roads and Streets as part of the City and County Design Standards." This document is intended to clarify the use of the Geometric Cross Section chart as part of the standards. This document will be distributed as a guidance document and will not become part of the standards. When the document is finalized it will be distributed and placed on the internet. It was also suggested that the PMR section of the LAG be reviewed for information on expectations in reference to the standards. If not, additions may be appropriate.

***Action Item:** Ron will distribute and post on internet site when finalized and research PMR section of the LAG.*

Draft Guidelines for Accessible Public Rights of Way

The committee reviewed and discussed the document. Concerns on tolerances and what flexibility would be allowed were noted. Paula Reeves attended the AASHTO subcommittee meeting and will address specific questions if needed. The committee felt that AASHTO's comments were appropriate and will influence the final document.

***Action Item:** Paula to address specific questions if needed.*

Design Deviations vs. Design Exceptions on Trails

Al King outlined the challenges interpreting or selecting design standards for trails. What is the standard? What is the minimum? Do we want to create a standard? Should trails be treated as a design exception? Discussion took place on providing access, the compatibility of the WSDOT Design Manual with FHWA guidance, multi use trails, and liability issues. Al asked the committee to think about these issues. He asked – "As a committee what would you do?"

***Action Item:** Committee will consider questions that were raised and be prepared to discuss at next meeting.*

Traffic Calming Guidance

The committee reviewed documents on traffic calming from the City of Portland. There continues to be requests for information on standards for trails. Discussion took place on location, design and the effectiveness of horizontal shifts and vertical deflections. There was consensus that speed humps on arterials are not appropriate and guidance is needed. Gary Hughes pointed out in the August 1997, ITE Journal, "In current form TCM's are applicable to two classes of roadways: local streets and collector streets." This article also referenced the 2001 Green Book and the MUTCD. With no known standard, engineers need to make judgments based on the best available practices. The committee was asked to review the information for future discussion. It was also decided to obtain a copy of the ITE Traffic calming guidance.

***Action Item:** Committee members to review information. Ron will get copy of ITE Traffic Calming Guidance.*

Roundabout Design Standard

The committee wanted more time to review chapter 915 of the WSDOT Design Manual before adopting as a standard and not just reference the document.

***Action Item:** Committee members to review chapter 915 prior to next meeting.*

Adoption of AASHTO Very Low Volume Roads

The committee voted to adopt the AASHTO Very Low Volume Roads publication as part of the standards.

***Action Item:** Ron will make appropriate edits to the chapter to reflect the publication as a standard and send out to the committee for review prior to publication. Al King will send out an email on the adoption making them available for use.*

Clear Zone Policy

Al King gave the committee an overview on the WSDOT Design Manual supplement, "Design Clear Zone" and a draft instructional letter "Jurisdiction Over State Highways Within Cities." The applications of standards were discussed. Changes to AASHTO generated debate on references from the 2001 Green Book to the AASHTO Roadside Design Guide. The Chart in the Roadside Design Guide, page 3-6 was applied to different scenarios and it was found that it did not really fit for urban areas. Dick Albin cautioned the group not to just reference AASHTO for clear zone. He questioned - what AASHTO? You may get conflicting information with references to other documents. There are many options, the Professional Engineer needs to evaluate each situation and justify decisions made. The committee wanted to add a footnote to the AASHTO reference in the standard for clear zone that reflects there is a need for judgment based on circumstances and the need to read AASHTO entirely when making decisions. Also, add information that the WSDOT Design Manual reduced the clear zone to 10' on 35 MPH or less roads.

Action Item: Ron will draft a footnote and information about the WSDOT Design Manual change to the standards and send out for review.

Stopping Sight Distance

The committee discussed the height of object for stopping sight distance change in the 2001 AASHTO Green Book. WSDOT is not adopting this change at this time. A WSDOT Design Manual supplement will be out soon. The committee wants to update the City and County standards with the desirable being the old standard (6”) and use the 2001 AASHTO (2’) for a minimum.

Action Item: Ron will draft appropriate edits and send out for review.

Design Matrix

The committee reviewed the draft matrix and definitions. There were a variety of suggestions for changes. Suggestions included – change project types to reflect 2R and 3R; change the matrix to a checklist, not setting design levels. Information was presented outlining the background of the matrix concept and how it is beneficial to designers. Once the matrix is complete the standards will need to be reviewed for consistency and training on its use would be needed.

Action Item: Ron will create a couple different formats and send out for review.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30PM.